Feedback Network Models for Quantum Transport

John Gough[1, *]

[1] *Aberystwyth University, Aberystwyth, SY23 3BZ, United Kingdom*

(Dated: September 1, 2014)

Quantum feedback networks have been introduced in quantum optics as a set of rules for constructing arbitrary networks of quantum mechanical systems connected by uni-directional quantum optical fields, and has allowed for a system theoretic approach to open quantum optics systems. Our aim here is to establish a network theory for quantum transport systems where typically the mediating fields between systems are bi-directional. Mathematically this leads us to study quantum feedback networks where fields arrive at ports in input-output pairs, which is then just a specially case of the uni-directional theory. However, it is conceptually important to develop this theory in the context of quantum transport theory, and the resulting theory extends traditional approaches which tends to view the components in quantum transport as scatterers for the various fields, in the process allows us to consider emission and absorption of field quanta by these components. The quantum feedback network theory is applicable to both Bose and Fermi fields, moreover it applies to nonlinear dynamics for the component systems. In this first paper on the subject, we advance the general theory, but study the case of linear passive quantum components in some detail.

PACS numbers: 05.60.Gg, 02.30.Yy, 03.65.-w 42.50.Lc

arXiv:1408.6991v1 [quant-ph] 29 Aug 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to extend the formalism of quantum feedback networks [1],[2] from their current applications to quantum optical, and more recently optomechanical systems, to quantum transport networks. In the quantum optics applications, one usually treats the noise fields interacting with the system as uni-directional. In the input-output approach of Gardiner and Collett, see [3], this arises naturally and may be understood as a specific case of the LSZ formalism of quantum field theory, however, physically this is also justified by the fact that bi-directional quantum optical fields may be always made uni-directional by using an optical isolator.

The quantum feedback network theory is built on the general theory of open quantum stochastic evolutions developed by Hudson and Parthasarathy [4] which goes beyond Gardiner's theory by allowing the system to scatter noise quanta as well as emit and absorb them - now generally referred to as the SLH formalism, which we recall in the next section.

There has been increasing interest in developing control theory for quantum transport models. The control of solid state cavity QED devices in place of traditional photonic systems, see e.g. [6] for super-conducting qubit examples, has started to lead to some of the techniques applied to control quantum optical devices being applied in new settings. Coupling a QED cavity to a quantum dot has been shown to allow control of the cavity reflectivity [7], as well as the possibility to generate non-classical states of light [8], see [9] and [10] for an overview of recent applications to photonics and quantum dots in photonic crystal technologies. Quantum dots have also been used to stabilise mesoscopic electric currents by means of feedback [11], with proposals for delayed feedback [12] and stabilisation of pure qubit states [13]. As with quantum optical devices, there has been a move away from table top experimental set-ups towards on-chip devices, and strong photonphoton interactions have been shown to be implementable on integrated photonic chips were quantum dots embedded in photonic-crystal nanocavities [14].

A first step in extending quantum feedback networks to quantum transport problems has been made in [15], which treated the scattering of the noise quanta only, but considered control methodologies. Here, however, we wish to extend the theory to general linear systems which allow for more general models of dissipation. This leads to the framework in which to apply the standard techniques of measurement-based and coherent quantum feedback techniques. We expect that the theory presented here should be readily implementable with existing toolboxes for simulating quantum feedback networks [16], [17].

Although the theory is applicable to general coupling of the fields to the components, we will develop the linear theory in some detail. Here the chain scattering representation proves to be essential approach. We point out that there exists a well-developed theory of control based on this approach due to Kimura [18], and which we exploit here. The results on lossless systems is particular relevant to the linear passive models which we consider here. We also wish to acknowledge the prior work of Yanagisawa and Kimura [19], [20] on quantum linear models which as far as we know was the first to apply chain scattering techniques to linear quantum networks.

For transparency we restrictive to passive systems [21], however it it clear that many of the results presented here extend should carry over to quantum transport networks which include active components [23].

* jug@aber.ac.uk

II. THE SLH-FORMALISM

For open Markov systems driven by n vacuum noise inputs, the model is specified by a triple

$$\mathbf{G} \sim (S, L, H)$$

referred to as the set of Hudson-Parthasarathy coefficients, or more prosaically as the "SLH". Their roles are to describe the input-to-output scattering $S = [S_{jk}]$ of the external noise fields $b_k(t)$, the coupling $L = [L_j]$ of the noise to the system, and the internal Hamiltonian H of the system respectively.

The SLH formalism for quantum Markov models deals with the category of models

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} S_{11} & \cdots & S_{1n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ S_{n1} & \cdots & S_{nn} \end{bmatrix}, L = \begin{bmatrix} L_1 \\ \vdots \\ L_n \end{bmatrix}, H,$$

where the S_{jk}, L_k, H are operators on the component system Hilbert space.



FIG. 1. (color online) A component representing a quantum mechanical system driven by several input fields. There will be the same number of output fields. It is often convenient to think of grouped inputs with multiplicity greater than one.

These may be assimilated into the *model matrix*

$$\mathsf{V} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{2}L^*L - iH & -L^*S \\ L & S \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{2}\sum_j L_j^*L_j - iH & -\sum_j L_j^*S_{j1} & \cdots & -\sum_j L_j^*S_{jm} \\ L_1 & S_{11} & \cdots & S_{1n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ L_n & S_{n1} & \cdots & S_{nn} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathsf{V}_{00} & \mathsf{V}_{01} & \cdots & \mathsf{V}_{0m} \\ \mathsf{V}_{10} & \mathsf{V}_{11} & \cdots & \mathsf{V}_{1n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathsf{V}_{n0} & \mathsf{V}_{n1} & \cdots & \mathsf{V}_{nn} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We recall briefly the class of Markov models for open quantum systems. The system with Hilbert space $\mathfrak{h}$ driven by n independent Bose quantum processes with Fock space $\mathfrak{F}$ will have a unitary evolution $V_{\mathbf{G}}(t)$ on the space $\mathfrak{h} \otimes \mathfrak{F}$ where $V_{\mathbf{G}}(t)$ is the solution to the quantum stochastic differential equation [4]

$$dV_{\mathbf{G}}(t) = \{(S_{jk} - \delta_{jk}) \otimes d\Lambda_{jk}(t) + L_j \otimes dB_j^*(t) - L_j^* S_{jk} \otimes dB_k(t) - (\frac{1}{2}L_k^*L_k + iH) \otimes dt\}\, V_{\mathbf{G}}(t)$$

with initial condition $V_{\mathbf{G}}(0) = I$. (We adopt the convention that repeated Latin indices imply a summation over the range $1, \cdots, n$.) Formally, the Bose noise can be thought of as arising from quantum white noise processes $b_k(t)$ satisfying a set singular of commutation relations

$$[b_j(t), b_k(s)^*] = \delta_{jk}\delta(t-s),$$

with

$$B_j(t) = \int_0^t b_j(s)ds, \quad B_j^*(t) = \int_0^t b_j(s)^* ds,$$
$$\Lambda_{jk}(t) = \int_0^t b_j(s)^* b_k(s) ds.$$

The conditions guaranteeing unitarity are that $S = [S_{jk}]$ is unitary, $L = [L_j]$ is bounded and H self-adjoint. In the autonomous case we may assume that the operator coefficients S_{jk}, L_j, H are fixed system operators, however there is little difficulty in allowing them to be time dependent, or more generally be adapted processes, that is $S_{jk}(t), L_j(t), H(t)$ depend on the noise up to time t. The process $V_{\mathbf{G}}(t)$ will inherit this adaptedness property.

For a fixed system operator X we set

$$j_t^{\mathbf{G}}(X) \triangleq V_{\mathbf{G}}(t)^* \,[X \otimes I]\, V_{\mathbf{G}}(t). \tag{1}$$

Then from the quantum Itō calculus [4] we get the *Heisenberg-Langevin Equations*

$$dj_t^{\mathbf{G}}(X) = j_t^{\mathbf{G}}(\mathcal{L}_{jk}X) \otimes d\Lambda_{jk}(t) + j_t^{\mathbf{G}}(\mathcal{L}_{j0}X) \otimes dB_j^*(t) + j_t^{\mathbf{G}}(\mathcal{L}_{0k}X) \otimes dB_k(t) + j_t^{\mathbf{G}}(\mathcal{L}_{00}X) \otimes dt \tag{2}$$

where the Evans-Hudson superoperators $\mathcal{L}_{\mu\nu}$ are explicitly given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{jk}X = S_{lj}^* X S_{lk} - \delta_{jk}X,$$
$$\mathcal{L}_{j0}X = S_{lj}^*[X, L_l],$$
$$\mathcal{L}_{0k}X = [L_l^*, X]S_{lk}$$
$$\mathcal{L}_{00}X = \frac{1}{2}L_l^*[X, L_l] + \frac{1}{2}[L_l^*, X]L_l + i\,[X, H]\,.$$

In particular $\mathcal{L}_{00}$ takes the generic form of a Lindblad generator.

The *output processes* are then defined to be

$$B_j^{\text{out}}(t) \triangleq V_{\mathbf{G}}(t)^* \,[I \otimes B_j(t)]\, V_{\mathbf{G}}(t),$$

Again using the quantum Itō rules, we see that

$$dB_k^{\rm out} = j_t^{\mathbf{G}}(S_{kl})dB_l(t) + j_t^{\mathbf{G}}(L_k)dt.$$

The input-output relations for the column vector $B^{\rm out} = \left[B_j^{\rm out}\right]$can be written as a *Galilean transformation*

$$\begin{bmatrix} dt^{\rm out} \\ dB^{\rm out}(t) \end{bmatrix} = j_t^{\mathbf{G}}(M) \begin{bmatrix} dt \\ dB(t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad M = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ L & S \end{bmatrix}.$$

A. Networks

The rules for construction arbitrary network architectures were derived in [1].

1. The Parallel Sum Rule

If we have several quantum Markov models with independent inputs then they may be assembled into a single SLH model, see Fig. 2.



FIG. 2. (color online) Several SLH models run in parallel: they correspond to one single SLH model.

$$\boxplus_{j=1}^{n}(S_j, L_j, H_j) = \left(\begin{bmatrix} S_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & S_n \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} L_1 \\ \vdots \\ L_n \end{bmatrix}, H_1 + \cdots + H_n \right).$$

Note that the components need not be distinct - that is, observable associated with one component are not assumed to commute with those of others. In this case the definition is not quite so trivial as it may first appear.

2. The Feedback Reduction Rule

If we wish to feedback an output back in as an input, we obtain a reduced model as depicted in Fig. 3.



FIG. 3. (color online) We feed selected outputs back in as inputs to get a reduced model.

The feedback reduction yields the model matrix [1]

$$\left[\mathscr{F}_{(r,s)}(\mathsf{V}, T)\right]_{\alpha\beta} = \mathsf{V}_{\alpha\beta} + \mathsf{V}_{\alpha r} T \left(1 - \mathsf{V}_{rs} T\right)^{-1} \mathsf{V}_{s\beta} \quad (3)$$

for $\alpha \neq r$ and $\beta \neq s$. We remain in the category of SLH models provided that T is unitary and the network is well-posed, that is $1 - \mathsf{V}_{rs}T$ is invertible.

3. Construction

If, for instance, we wished to determine the effective SLH model for the network shown in Fig. 4, then we would proceed as follows: first of all we disconnect all the internal lines, this leaves us with an "open-loop" description where all the components are have independent inputs and outputs, and at this stage we use the parallel sum to collect all these components into a single open-loop quantum Markov component; the next step is to make the connections and this involves feeding selected outputs back in as inputs from the open-loop description, and to this end we use the feedback reduction formula. This process has recently been automated using a workflow capture software QHDL [16] and [17].



FIG. 4. (color online) An arbitrary quantum feedback network.

B. Systems in Series

The simplest model consists of two systems cascaded together as shown in Fig. 5 and is equivalent to the single component, see [2],

$$(S_2, L_2, H_2) \lhd (S_1, L_1, H_1) = \left(S_2 S_1, L_2 + S_2 L_1, H_1 + H_2 + \mathrm{Im}\left\{L_2^\dagger S_2 L_1\right\}\right).$$

We refer to $G = G_2 \lhd G_1$ above as the series product of the G_1 and G_2. It is an associative, but clearly non-commutative product on the class of suitably composable SLH models.



FIG. 5. (color online) Systems in series.

C. Fermion Fields

In the above, we have set out the theory for Bosonic field inputs, however, in many applications to quantum transport it would be natural to also consider fermionic fields. We are in the fortunate situation that the quantum stochastic calculus has a Fermionic version where we may consider anti-commuting fields $b_k^{in}(t), b_k^{in\dagger}(t)$. The theory turns out to be structurally identical to the Bose theory provided the S and H operators are even parity (so commute with the fields) and the L operators are odd (and so anti-commute with the fields.

The theory of Fermion quantum stochastic calculus is presented in [24].

III. QUANTUM TRANSPORT NETWORKS

The standard component in quantum transport models is a device which may have several contact points (or leads) which accept quantum field signals. For definiteness, let us label the leads as $1, 2, \cdots, m$ and let n_k denote the multiplicity of the kth lead. Our aim is to describe these devices as quantum Markov models using the SLH formalism, and to develop network rules to describe interconnected quantum transport components.

The main difference between the quantum transport models and quantum feedback networks is that in the former the fields are bi-directional while in the latter they are uni-directional. This means that we may use the SLH models to describe quantum transport components, but typically have to have both an input and an output field to model each field terminating at a given lead, see Fig. 7.



FIG. 6. (color online) Single component with multiple lead contacts.



FIG. 7. (color online) A bi-directional contact may be considered as an equivalent uni-directional input/output pair.

As such the quantum transport models can be thought of as a special form of SLH model, and their networks as a restricted class of quantum feedback networks.

A two-lead system is sketched in Fig. 8 (for simplicity we may assume that each lead has multiplicity one, but this readily extends to multiple fields) and we formally identify this as a 2-input 2-output port SLH system with

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} S_{11} & S_{12} \\ S_{21} & S_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \; L = \begin{bmatrix} L_1 \\ L_2 \end{bmatrix}, \; H.$$



FIG. 8. (color online) A two lead quantum transport device is naturally modelled as a 2 input - 2 output SLH component.

The usual convention of displaying an SLH model, with all inputs on one side and all outputs on the other, needs to be modified so that we end up with input 1 and output

1 on one side and input 2 and output 2 on the other. The transmission and reflection coefficients coefficients are listed in Fig. 9 and we identify the matrix S with the usual quantum transport scattering matrix as

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} S_{YY} & S_{YX} \\ S_{XY} & S_{XX} \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} r & t' \\ t & r' \end{bmatrix}. \tag{4}$$



FIG. 9. (color online) The usual input/output description is modified to have inputs and outputs corresponding to a given lead all appear grouped one one side.

A. Quantum Transport Components in Series

Our first step to build a network is to place two components, $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{B}$, in series as shown in Fig. 10. Here we connect the quantum transmission line between two contact leads as indicated in the upper part. In the SLH framework, we connect up the inputs and outputs as shown in the lower part of Fig. 10.



FIG. 10. (color online) A pair of cascaded quantum transport systems is reinterpreted as a quantum feedback network.

Let us take the SLH description of device $\mathscr{A}$ to be

$$G_{\mathscr{A}} \sim \left(S_{\mathscr{A}} = \begin{bmatrix} S_{\mathscr{A}}^{-+} & S_{\mathscr{A}}^{--} \\ S_{\mathscr{A}}^{++} & S_{\mathscr{A}}^{+-} \end{bmatrix}, L_{\mathscr{A}} = \begin{bmatrix} L_{\mathscr{A}}^{-} \\ L_{\mathscr{A}}^{+} \end{bmatrix}, H_{\mathscr{A}} \right),$$

with a similar convention for $\mathscr{B}$. Here the indices $\pm$ indicate right and left propagating noise fields.

The situation of two quantum transport systems in series differs dramatically from the series product for unidirectional networks as now we have the presence of an algebraic feedback loop, see Fig 11.



FIG. 11. (color online) The algebraic loop appearing in the cascaded quantum transport set-up in Fig. 10.

In particular, we need the feedback reduction formula (3) of [1] to compute the resulting SLH. The construction is a *Redheffer star product*, and is given by, see [1]

$$G_{\mathscr{A}\star\mathscr{B}} \sim (S_{\mathscr{A}\star\mathscr{B}}, L_{\mathscr{A}\star\mathscr{B}}, H_{\mathscr{A}\star\mathscr{B}})$$

where

$$S_{\mathscr{A}\star\mathscr{B}} = \begin{bmatrix} S_{\mathscr{A}}^{-+} + S_{\mathscr{A}}^{--} W_{\mathscr{B}\mathscr{A}\mathscr{B}}^{-+} S_{\mathscr{B}}^{++} & S_{\mathscr{A}}^{--} Z_{\mathscr{B}\mathscr{A}}^{-} S_{\mathscr{B}}^{--} \\ S_{\mathscr{B}}^{++} Z_{\mathscr{A}\mathscr{B}}^{+} S_{\mathscr{A}}^{++} & S_{\mathscr{B}}^{+-} + S_{\mathscr{B}}^{++} W_{\mathscr{A}\mathscr{B}\mathscr{A}}^{+-} S_{\mathscr{A}}^{--} \end{bmatrix}, \quad L_{\mathscr{A}\star\mathscr{B}} = \begin{bmatrix} L_{\mathscr{A}}^{-} + S_{\mathscr{A}}^{--} Z_{\mathscr{B}\mathscr{A}}^{-} \left(L_{\mathscr{B}}^{-} + S_{\mathscr{B}}^{-+} L_{\mathscr{B}}^{+} \right) \\ L_{\mathscr{B}}^{+} + S_{\mathscr{B}}^{++} Z_{\mathscr{A}\mathscr{B}}^{+} \left(L_{\mathscr{A}}^{+} + S_{\mathscr{A}}^{+-} L_{\mathscr{B}}^{-} \right) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$H_{\mathscr{A}\star\mathscr{B}} = H_{\mathscr{A}} + H_{\mathscr{B}} + \mathrm{Im} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} L_{\mathscr{A}}^{+\dagger} + L_{\mathscr{B}}^{+\dagger} S_{\mathscr{B}}^{++}, L_{\mathscr{B}}^{-\dagger} + L_{\mathscr{A}}^{-\dagger} S_{\mathscr{A}}^{--} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Z_{\mathscr{A}\mathscr{B}}^{+} & W_{\mathscr{A}\mathscr{B}\mathscr{A}}^{+-} \\ W_{\mathscr{B}\mathscr{A}\mathscr{B}}^{-+} & Z_{\mathscr{B}\mathscr{A}}^{-} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} L_{\mathscr{A}}^{+} \\ L_{\mathscr{B}}^{-} \end{bmatrix} \right\}, \tag{5}$$

with the following operators arising from the algebraic loop

$$\begin{aligned} Z^{+}_{\mathscr{A}\mathscr{B}} &= \left(1 - S^{+-}_{\mathscr{A}} S^{-+}_{\mathscr{B}}\right)^{+1}, \\ Z^{-}_{\mathscr{B}\mathscr{A}} &= \left(1 - S^{-+}_{\mathscr{B}} S^{+-}_{\mathscr{A}}\right)^{+1}, \\ W^{+-}_{\mathscr{A}\mathscr{B}\mathscr{A}} &= S^{+-}_{\mathscr{A}} Z^{-}_{\mathscr{B}\mathscr{A}} = Z^{+}_{\mathscr{A}\mathscr{B}} S^{+-}_{\mathscr{A}}, \\ W^{-+}_{\mathscr{B}\mathscr{A}\mathscr{B}} &= S^{-+}_{\mathscr{B}} Z^{+}_{\mathscr{A}\mathscr{B}} = Z^{-}_{\mathscr{B}\mathscr{A}} S^{-+}_{\mathscr{B}}. \end{aligned}$$

IV. QUANTUM LINEAR PASSIVE MARKOV MODELS

It is convenient to assemble the inputs into a following column vectors of length n

$$\mathbf{b}^{\text{in}}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} b_1(t) \\ \vdots \\ b_n(t) \end{bmatrix}.$$

The input-output relations may then be written more compactly as $\mathbf{b}^{\text{out}}(t) = j_t(S)\,\mathbf{b}^{\text{in}}(t) + j_t(L)$.

We now specialise to a linear model of a quantum mechanical system consisting of a family of harmonic oscillators $\{a_j : j = 1, \cdots, m\}$ with canonical commutation relations $[a_j, a_k] = 0 = \left[a_j^\dagger, a_k^\dagger\right]$ and $\left[a_j, a_k^\dagger\right] = \delta_{jk}$. We collect into column vectors:

$$\mathbf{a} = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 \\ \vdots \\ a_m \end{bmatrix}. \tag{6}$$

Our interest is in the general linear open dynamical system and this corresponds to the following situation:

1) The S_{jk} are scalars.
2) The $L_j's$ are linear, i.e., there exist constants c_{jk} such that $L_j \equiv \sum_k c_{jk} a_k$.
3) H is quadratic, i.e., there exist constants ω_{jk} such that $H = \sum_{jk} a_j^\dagger \omega_{jk} a_k$.

The complex damping is $\frac{1}{2}L^\dagger L + iH = -\mathbf{a}^\dagger A \mathbf{a}$ where

$$A = -\frac{1}{2}C^\dagger C - i\Omega \tag{7}$$

with $C = (c_{jk})$ and $\Omega = (\omega_{jk})$. Note that $\Omega = \Omega^\dagger$ because H is self-adjoint, hence the real part of A is $-\frac{1}{2}C^\dagger C \leq 0$.

The Heisenberg-Langevin equations for $\mathbf{a}(t) = j_t(\mathbf{a})$ and the input-output relations then become

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{a}}(t) &= A\mathbf{a}(t) - C^\dagger S \mathbf{b}(t), \\ \mathbf{b}^{\text{out}}(t) &= S\mathbf{b}(t) + C\mathbf{a}(t). \end{aligned}$$

These linear equations are amenable to Laplace transform techniques [19],[20]. We define for $\text{Re}s > 0$

$$X[s] = \int_0^\infty e^{-st} X(t)\, dt,$$

where X is now any of our stochastic processes. Note that $\dot{\mathbf{a}}[s] = s\mathbf{a}[s] - \mathbf{a}$. We find that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}[s] &= -(sI_m - A)^{-1} C^\dagger S \mathbf{b}^{\text{in}}[s] + (sI_m - A)^{-1}\mathbf{a}, \\ \mathbf{b}^{\text{out}}[s] &= S\mathbf{b}^{\text{in}}[s] + C\mathbf{a}[s]. \end{aligned}$$

The operator $\mathbf{a}[s]$ may be eliminated to give

$$\mathbf{b}^{\text{out}}[s] = \Xi(s)\,\mathbf{b}^{\text{in}}[s] + \xi(s)\,\mathbf{a} \tag{8}$$

where the *transfer matrix function* is

$$\Xi(s) \triangleq S - C(sI_m - A)^{-1} C^\dagger S \tag{9}$$

and $\xi[s] = C(sI_m - A)^{-1}$.

If we average over the vacuum state of the environment, then we would find that $\frac{d}{dt}\langle \mathbf{a}(t)\rangle_{\text{vac}} = A\langle \mathbf{a}(t)\rangle_{\text{vac}}$. The system is said to be internally stable if $\langle \mathbf{a}(t)\rangle_{\text{vac}} \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$. This occurs if and only if A is *Hurwitz*, that is, all its eigenvalues have negative real part.

As an example, consider a single mode cavity coupling to the input field via $L = \sqrt{\gamma}a$, and with Hamiltonian $H = \omega a^\dagger a$. This implies $A = -(\frac{\gamma}{2} + i\omega)$ and $C = \sqrt{\gamma}$. If the output picks up an additional phase $S = e^{i\phi}$, the corresponding transfer function is then computed to be

$$\Xi_{cavity}(s) = e^{i\phi}\,\frac{s + i\omega - \frac{\gamma}{2}}{s + i\omega + \frac{\gamma}{2}}. \tag{10}$$

For a single mode a with two inputs b_1^{in} and b_2^{in}, the choice

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, C = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\gamma_1} \\ \sqrt{\gamma_2} \end{bmatrix}, \Omega = \omega_0$$

describes the damped harmonic oscillator with unperturbed Hamiltonian $H = \omega_0 a^\dagger a$ and coupling operators $L_1 = \sqrt{\gamma_1}a$ and $L_2 = \sqrt{\gamma_2}a$ to the respective inputs. The transfer function is then

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi(s) &= \frac{1}{s + \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) + i\omega_0} \\ &\times \begin{bmatrix} s - \frac{1}{2}\gamma_1 + \frac{1}{2}\gamma_2 + i\omega_0 & \sqrt{\gamma_1\gamma_2} \\ \sqrt{\gamma_1\gamma_2} & s + \frac{1}{2}\gamma_1 - \frac{1}{2}\gamma_2 + i\omega_0 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

The models are therefore determined completely by the matrices (S, C, Ω) with $S \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}, C \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times m}$ and $\Omega \in \mathbb{C}^{m\times m}$ which of course give the SLH coefficients. We shall use the convention $\left[\begin{array}{c|c} A & B \\ \hline C & D \end{array}\right](s) = D + C(s - A)^{-1}B$ for matrices $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m\times m}, B \in \mathbb{C}^{m\times n}, C \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times m}$ and $D \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$, and write the transfer matrix function as

$$\Xi(s) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A & -C^\dagger S \\ \hline C & S \end{array}\right](s), \tag{12}$$

where $A = -\frac{1}{2}C^\dagger C - i\Omega$. We note the decomposition

$$\Xi = \left[I_n - C(sI_m - A)^{-1}C^\dagger\right] S \equiv \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A & -C^\dagger \\ \hline C & I_n \end{array}\right] S.$$

Lemma 1 (All-pass representation of Ξ.) We may write the transfer function Ξ for a passive linear quantum system as

$$\Xi(s) = \frac{1 - \frac{1}{2}\Sigma(s)}{1 + \frac{1}{2}\Sigma(s)} S \tag{13}$$

where

$$\Sigma(s) = C \frac{1}{s + i\Omega} C^\dagger. \tag{14}$$

proof: From the Woodbury matrix identity we find

$$\frac{1}{s + \frac{1}{2}C^\dagger C + i\Omega} = \frac{1}{s + i\Omega} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{s + i\Omega} C^\dagger \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{2} C \frac{1}{s + i\Omega} C^\dagger} C \frac{1}{s + i\Omega},$$

which we substitute into (9) to get the result. □

Theorem 1 The transfer function of a passive system is inner, that is $\Xi(i\omega)$ is unitary for all real ω not an eigenvalue of Ω.

proof: For ω not an eigenvalue of Ω, $\Sigma(i\omega) = -iC\frac{1}{\omega + \Omega}C^\dagger$ is well-defined and we have $\Sigma(i\omega)^\dagger = -\Sigma(i\omega)$, so that unitarity of $\Xi(i\omega)$ follows from (13). □

Transfer functions that are inner are otherwise referred to as all-pass transfer functions as classically this means that harmonic signals of arbitrary frequency pass through without attenuation. In the current context it relates the fact that the output processes are is again canonical field processes.

A. The Chain Scattering Representation

We now consider a linear transformation

$$\begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{bmatrix} = K \begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} K_{12} & K_{12} \\ K_{21} & K_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{bmatrix} \tag{15}$$

where u_1, u_2, z_1, z_2 are all column vectors of equal length. Our aim is to rewrite this in the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ u_1 \end{bmatrix} = \texttt{CHAIN}(K) \begin{bmatrix} u_2 \\ z_2 \end{bmatrix} \tag{16}$$

which is possible if K_{21} is invertible, in which case we have

$$\texttt{CHAIN}(K) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} K_{12} - K_{11}K_{21}^{-1}K_{22} & K_{12}K_{21}^{-1} \\ -K_{21}^{-1}K_{22} & K_{21}^{-1} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{17}$$

with inverse transformation

$$\texttt{CHAIN}^{-1}(M) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} M_{12}M_{22}^{-1}; & M_{11} - M_{12}M_{22}^{-1}M_{21} \\ M_{22}^{-1} & M_{22}^{-1}M_{21} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The linear system (15) is an input-output representation, while the new system (16) is called the chain-scattering representation. In the former we have a state-based model where the system is driven by the inputs u_1, u_2 and produces the outputs z_1, z_2, while in the latter the system is a wave scatterer from the wave u_2, z_2 at port 2 to the wave z_1, u_1 at port 1.

In the case where K is unitary, we have that

$$|u_1|^2 + |u_2|^2 = |z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2$$

and rearranging gives

$$|u_1|^2 - |z_1|^2 = |z_2|^2 - |u_2|^2.$$

This suggests that if K implements a unitary transformation for field inputs, then $\texttt{CHAIN}(K)$ is implements a Bogoliubov transformation. We shall establish this fact next.

1. *Invariance Symmetries of Chain Pairs*

Definition The $\flat$-conjugation is defined on matrices of dimension $2n$ by

$$X^\flat = J_n X^\dagger J_n$$

where

$$J_n = \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ 0 & -I_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

We say that X is a $\flat$-isometry, $\flat$-coisometry, if we have $X^\flat X = I_{2n}$, $XX^\flat = I_{2n}$, respectively. If X is both a $\flat$-isometry and a $\flat$-coisometry, then we say that it is a $\flat$-unitary.

We now state the main structural properties of the chain scattering transformation.

Theorem 2 A matrix K is an isometry, coisometry, unitary if and only if $M = \texttt{CHAIN}(K)$ is a $\flat$-isometry. $\flat$-coisometry, $\flat$-unitary, respectively

The proof is quite cumbersome and we relegate to the Appendix.

B. Wave Scattering in Quantum Transport

It is convenient to relabel the input and output fields (and their Laplace transforms) appearing in the upper

picture in Fig. 9 as

$$\begin{aligned} b_{X+} &= b_X^{\text{out}} \\ b_{X-} &= b_X^{\text{in}} \\ b_{Y+} &= b_Y^{\text{in}} \\ b_{Y-} &= b_Y^{\text{out}} \end{aligned}$$

where the subscripts $+/-$ now indicate right and left propagating fields respectively. The relation between these fields is then

$$\begin{bmatrix} b_{Y-} \\ b_{X+} \end{bmatrix} = \Xi \begin{bmatrix} b_{Y+} \\ b_{X-} \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_{YY}^{-+} & \Xi_{YX}^{--} \\ \Xi_{XY}^{++} & \Xi_{XX}^{+-} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} b_{Y+} \\ b_{X-} \end{bmatrix}.$$

where we break down the transfer matrix into block form. We now perform the swap described in the lower picture in Fig. 9.

The equations may be rearranged as

$$\begin{bmatrix} b_{Y-} \\ b_{Y+} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma_{YX}^{--} & \Gamma_{YX}^{-+} \\ \Gamma_{YX}^{+-} & \Gamma_{YX}^{++} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} b_{X-} \\ b_{X+} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{18}$$

or equivalently

$$\overleftrightarrow{b_Y} = \Gamma_{YX} \overleftrightarrow{b_X},$$

where we introduce the following shorthand notation for the inputs and outputs at a contact lead X

$$\overleftrightarrow{b_X} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} b_{X-} \\ b_{X+} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{19}$$

It immediately follows that

$$\Gamma_{YX}(s) \equiv \texttt{CHAIN}\left(\Xi(s)\right) \tag{20}$$

that is

$$\Gamma_{XY} = \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_{YX}^{--} - \Xi_{YY}^{-+}(\Xi_{XY}^{++})^{-1}\Xi_{XX}^{+-} & \Xi_{YY}^{-+}(\Xi_{XY}^{++})^{-1} \\ -(\Xi_{XY}^{++})^{-1}\Xi_{XX}^{+-} & (\Xi_{XY}^{++})^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

Inversely, we have

$$\Xi = \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma_{YX}^{-+}\left(\Gamma_{YX}^{++}\right)^{-1} & \Gamma_{YX}^{--} - \Gamma_{YX}^{-+}\left(\Gamma_{YX}^{++}\right)^{-1}\Gamma_{YX}^{+-} \\ \left(\Gamma_{YX}^{++}\right)^{-1} & -\left(\Gamma_{YX}^{++}\right)^{-1}\Gamma_{YX}^{+-} \end{bmatrix}$$

Theorem 3 The function $\Gamma_{YX}(s) = \texttt{CHAIN}(\Xi(s))$ is a $\flat$-unitary for s on the imaginary axis, except for eigenvalues of $-i\Omega$.

This is an immediate corollary to Theorems 1 and 2.

Note that the transfer function Γ_{YX} connects the inputs and outputs at contact lead X to those at Y. As before, Γ_{YX}^{--} is a Schur complement of the transfer function Ξ in block matrix form. We shall always suppose that the chain-scattering representation is valid, that is Ξ_{XY}^{++} is invertible so that Γ_{YX} is well-defined.

1. Chain-Scattering for Quantum Transport Devices in Series

Let us return to the devices in series shown in the upper diagram in Fig. 10. We have

$$\overleftrightarrow{b_{Y_1}} = \Gamma_{Y_1X_1}\overleftrightarrow{b_{X_1}}, \quad \overleftrightarrow{b_{Y_2}} = \Gamma_{Y_2X_2}\overleftrightarrow{b_{Y_2}},$$

however the identification $b_{Y_2,+} \equiv b_{X_1,+}$ and $b_{Y_2,-} \equiv b_{X_1,-}$ (i.e., $\overleftrightarrow{b_{Y_2}} \equiv \overleftrightarrow{b_{X_1}}$) now implies that

$$\overleftrightarrow{b_{Y_1}} = \Gamma_{Y_1X_1}\Gamma_{Y_2X_2}\overleftrightarrow{b_{Y_2}}. \tag{21}$$

The general rule is easy to state at this stage. For the chain of components shown in Fig. 12 we have

$$\Gamma_{Y_1X_n} = \Gamma_{Y_1X_1}\Gamma_{Y_2X_2}\cdots\Gamma_{Y_nX_n}. \tag{22}$$



FIG. 12. (color online) Several quantum transport components in a chain series.

2. Coprime Factorisations

We say that transfer function Γ_{YX} has a factorisation if we may write it as

$$\Gamma_{YX} = \Upsilon_Y^{-1}\Upsilon_X$$

and in this way we may write the lead-to-lead equations in a more symmetric form as

$$\Upsilon_X\overleftrightarrow{b_X} = \Upsilon_Y\overleftrightarrow{b_Y}.$$

So far we have not done anything particularly useful, however, we could ask for more properties of the factorisation.

Let H_∞ denote the set of Hardy functions, that is, the class of complex-matrix valued functions $M(s)$ that are analytic in the closed right hand complex plane ($\text{Re } s \geq 0$) with the property that the limit values $M(i\omega + 0^+)$ exist for almost all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ and there is a finite upper bound on the largest singular value of $M(s)$ over $\text{Re } s \geq 0$.

A factorisation $\Gamma_{YX} = \Upsilon_Y^{-1}\Upsilon_X$ will be useful for control and design purposes if both Υ_Y and Υ_X are rational functions in the Hardy class with the property that they have no common zeroes on the closed right hand plane, including $s = \infty$. The appropriate definition from control theory is given below, see for instance [22].

Definition: A pair of matrix valued functions Υ_X and Υ_Y are left coprime if there exists a pair of rational matrix functions Q, P in the Hardy class such that

$$\Upsilon_Y P - Q\Upsilon_X = I.$$

A left coprime factorisation of rational proper function Γ_{YX} is a factorisation $\Gamma_{YX} = \Upsilon_Y^{-1}\Upsilon_X$ where Υ_X and Υ_Y are left coprime, with Υ_Y^{-1} proper.

An important property of the chain-scattering representation is that

$$\Gamma_{YX} = \begin{bmatrix} I & -\Xi_{YY}^{-+} \\ 0 & \Xi_{XY}^{++} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_{YX}^{--} & 0 \\ -\Xi_{XX}^{+-} & I \end{bmatrix} \tag{23}$$

and if the original transfer function Ξ is stable this corresponds to a left coprime factorisation of Γ_{YX}. See Kimura, section 4.1 [18]. A right coprime factorisation is given by

$$\Gamma_{YX} = \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_{YX}^{--} & \Xi_{YY}^{-+} \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ \Xi_{XX}^{+-} & \Xi_{XY}^{++} \end{bmatrix}^{-1}.$$

3. Worked Example

We study a simple device corresponding to a single mode a with a pair of contact leads X and Y, both of which have one input and one output field. Here we assume that the device scatters the input fields like a beam splitter. but also is damped by these inputs, as well as undergoing its own harmonic frequency ω_0. In the Heisenberg-Langevin picture we consider dynamical equations

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}a(t) &= -(\gamma + i\omega_0)\, a(t) - \sqrt{\gamma} b_X^{\text{in}}(t) - \sqrt{\gamma} b_Y^{\text{in}}(t), \\ b_X^{\text{out}}(t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_X^{\text{in}}(t) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_Y^{\text{in}}(t) + \sqrt{\gamma} a(t), \\ b_X^{\text{out}}(t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_X^{\text{in}}(t) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_Y^{\text{in}}(t) + \sqrt{\gamma} a(t). \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to the choice

$$S = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad L = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\gamma} a \\ \sqrt{\gamma} a \end{bmatrix}, \quad H = \omega_0 a^\dagger a,$$

that is, $C = \sqrt{\gamma} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $\Omega = \omega_0$. The transfer function is then

$$\Xi[s] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \Theta(s) & -1 \\ \Theta(s) & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

with $\Theta(s) = \frac{s-\gamma+i\omega_0}{s+\gamma+i\omega_0}$. Using the chain transformation (20) we find that

$$\Gamma_{YX} = \begin{bmatrix} -\sqrt{2} & 1 \\ -1/\Theta(s) & \sqrt{2}/\Theta(s) \end{bmatrix}$$

which admits the coprime factorisation $\Gamma_{YX} = \Upsilon_Y^{-1}\Upsilon_X$ with

$$\Upsilon_Y = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Theta(s) \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Theta(s) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Upsilon_X = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

C. Stability and the Lossless Property

We have seen from Theorem 1 that the transfer function Ξ of a linear passive quantum system is inner (unitary almost everywhere on the imaginary axis). In addition, if the system is stable, that is, the matrix A appearing in the state-based model is Hurwitz, then following control theoretic terminology we say that the system Ξ is lossless. For lossless systems, we have that

$$\Xi^\dagger(s)\,\Xi(s) \leq I$$

in the closed right hand complex plane.

Similarly, we say that a chain scattering transfer function Γ is $\flat$-lossless if

$$\Gamma^\flat(s)\,\Gamma(s) \leq I,$$

for all $\mathrm{Re} s \geq 0$.

Generally speaking, connecting an assembly of stable components into a network may result in marginal instability. For instance, some marginal stability may arise, which in quantum devices correspond to decoherence free subspace which may be of importance in designing quantum memory storage. It is imperative to know when a given system is lossless. Fortunately, the two notions of losslessness above coincide.

Theorem 4: Ξ is $\flat$-lossless if and only if it takes the form $\Gamma = \texttt{CHAIN}(\Xi)$ where Ξ is lossless.

This is proved as Lemma 4.4 of Kimura's book [18].

1. State Space Realisations

If we have the triple (S, C, Ω) of the form

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} S_{YY} & S_{YX} \\ S_{XY} & S_{XX} \end{bmatrix}, C = \begin{bmatrix} C_Y \\ C_X \end{bmatrix},$$

leading to the transfer function

$$\Xi = \left[\begin{array}{c|cc} A & B_Y & B_X \\ \hline C_Y & S_{YY} & S_{YX} \\ C_X & S_{XY} & S_{XX} \end{array}\right]$$

where $A = -\frac{1}{2}C_X^\dagger C_X - \frac{1}{2}C_Y^\dagger C_Y - i\Omega$ and $B_k = -\sum_j C_j^\dagger S_{jk}$. It follows that

$$\Gamma_{YX} \equiv \left[\begin{array}{c|cc} A - B_Y S_{XY}^{-1} C_X & B_X - B_Y S_{XY}^{-1} S_{XX} & B_Y S_{XY}^{-1} \\ \hline C_Y - S_{YY} S_{XY}^{-1} C_X & S_{YX} - S_{YY} S_{XY}^{-1} S_{XX} & S_{YY} S_{XY}^{-1} \\ -S_{XY}^{-1} C_X & -S_{XY}^{-1} S_{XX} & S_{XY}^{-1} \end{array}\right],$$

see Kimura [18] section 4.2.

D. Feedback and Termination

We wish to consider now the effect of terminating a scattering sequence with a terminal component Δ, see Fig. 13. The chain scattering picture has a corresponding input-output representation where we see that the component Δ is in fact in loop. With the identifications

$$b_Y^{\text{out}} = b_{Y-}, \quad b_Y^{\text{in}} = b_{Y+} \tag{24}$$

and from the relation $b_{X-}[s] = \Delta(s)\, b_{X+}[s]$, we may derive the input-output relation

$$b_{Y-}[s] = \Phi(s)\; b_{Y+}[s]$$

where Φ is a fractional linear transformation, see [21],

$$\Phi = \Xi_{YY}^{-+} + \Xi_{YX}^{--}\, \Delta\, \left[I - \Xi_{XX}^{+-}\, \Delta\right]^{-1} \Xi_{XY}^{++}. \tag{25}$$



FIG. 13. (color online) A standard procedure in circuit theory is to terminate a cascade of devices with a terminal load $\mathscr{T}$. In the input-output representation, this amounts to a feedback arrangement as shown.

We stress that the set-up in Fig. 13 is the special linear dynamical situation of the more general situation appearing in the feedback reduction rule Fig. 3, where we have the operator theoretic fractional linear transformation (3).

We may obtain a similar expression in terms of the chain scattering representation Γ, see Fig. 14. Indeed we have

$$b_{Y-} = \left(\Gamma_{YX}^{--}\Delta + \Gamma_{YX}^{-+}\right) b_{X+},$$
$$b_{Y+} = \left(\Gamma_{YX}^{+-}\Delta + \Gamma_{YX}^{++}\right) b_{X+},$$

and so we deduce that

$$\Phi = \left(\Gamma_{YX}^{--}\Delta + \Gamma_{YX}^{-+}\right)\left(\Gamma_{YX}^{+-}\Delta + \Gamma_{YX}^{++}\right)^{-1}. \tag{26}$$



FIG. 14. (color online) The chain scattering representation of the terminal load.

This is equivalent to the homographic transformation from classical circuit theory, and we write $\Phi \equiv \mathtt{HM}(\Gamma, \Delta)$, following Kimura [18].

Theorem 5: Let Ξ be a quantum passive transfer functions determined by $\left(\begin{bmatrix} S_{YY} & S_{YX} \\ S_{XY} & S_{XX} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} C_Y \\ C_X \end{bmatrix}, \Omega\right)$ and let $\Delta = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A_\Delta & B_\Delta \\ \hline C_\Delta & D_\Delta \end{array}\right]$, where both representations are minimal [25]. A minimal realisation of $\Phi = \mathtt{HM}(\mathtt{CHAIN}(\Xi), \Delta)$ is given by

$$\Phi = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A_\Phi & B_\Phi \\ \hline C_\Phi & D_\Phi \end{array}\right]$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_\Phi &= \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{2}C^\dagger C - i\Omega & -C_Y^\dagger C_\Phi \\ 0 & A_\Delta \end{bmatrix} \\ &\quad + E_\Phi \left(S_{XY}D_\Delta + S_{XX}\right)^{-1}\left[C_X, \quad S_{XY}C_\Delta\right] \\ B_\Phi &= E_\Phi \left(S_{XY}D_\Delta + S_{XX}\right)^{-1} \\ C_\Phi &= \left[C_Y - D_\Phi C_X, \quad \left(S_{YY} - D_\Phi S_{XY}\right)C_\Delta\right] \\ D_\Phi &= \left(S_{YY}D_\Delta + S_{YX}\right)\left(S_{XY}D_\Delta + S_{XX}\right)^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where E_Φ is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \left(C_Y^\dagger S_{YY} + C_X^\dagger S_{XY}\right) D_\Delta + \left(C_Y^\dagger S_{YX} + C_X^\dagger S_{XX}\right) \\ BS_\Delta \end{bmatrix},$$

provided that the network is well-posed (that is, the operator $S_{XY}S_\Delta + S_{XX}$ is invertible). Given Ξ fixed, there will exist a Δ such that the network is internally stable, that is, A_Φ is Hurwitz, if and only if Ξ is lossless.

proof: The state based representation derives form equations (4.84-4.87) of Kimura with the explicit form of a quantum transfer function employed for Ξ. The internal stability result follows from Theorem 4.15 of Kimura which states that for $\flat$-unitary Γ, there will exist a Δ that make $\Phi = \mathtt{HM}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ internally stable if and only if Γ is $\flat$-lossless, along with the observation that $\Gamma = \mathtt{CHAIN}(\Xi)$ is automatically $\flat$-lossless whenever Ξ is lossless (see Theorem 4). □

Note that the theorem makes no claim that the stabilising Δ belongs to the class of transfer function corresponding to a (active or passive) quantum transfer function, only that it takes on a state-based model form. In

favourable situations, this may be synthesis as another quantum device, however it may entail using classical components.

E. Time delays

We now consider the network with delays in the transmission line. In the case of linear circuits, this is easily modelled by the transfer function

$$\theta(s) = e^{-s\tau}$$

where τ is the time delay in the transmission line. A simple network of two connected systems with delay is depicted in Fig. 15 below.



FIG. 15. (color online) Cascaded system with delay.

In this case the formula (21) for the cascade of quantum transport models takes the form

$$\overleftrightarrow{b}_{Y_1} = \Gamma_{Y_1X_1}\,\Theta\,\Gamma_{Y_2X_2}\,\overleftrightarrow{b}_{X_2}$$

where

$$\Theta = \begin{bmatrix} \theta & 0 \\ 0 & \theta^{-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

1. *Trapped mode*

In the special case where we have only scattering, the transfer function takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\Xi^{-+} &= r_{\mathscr{A}} + \theta^2 t'_{\mathscr{A}} t_{\mathscr{A}} r_{\mathscr{B}} \frac{1}{1-\theta^2 r_{\mathscr{A}} r'_{\mathscr{A}}},\\
\Xi^{--} &= \theta t'_{\mathscr{A}} t'_{\mathscr{B}} \frac{1}{1-\theta^2 r_{\mathscr{A}} r'_{\mathscr{A}}},\\
\Xi^{++} &= \theta t_{\mathscr{A}} t_{\mathscr{B}} \frac{1}{1-\theta^2 r_{\mathscr{A}} r'_{\mathscr{A}}},\\
\Xi^{+-} &= r'_{\mathscr{B}} + \theta t_{\mathscr{B}} t'_{\mathscr{B}} r'_{\mathscr{A}} \frac{1}{1-\theta^2 r_{\mathscr{A}} r'_{\mathscr{A}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

If we suppose that the transmittivity is weak of order with both $|t_{\mathscr{A}}|^2$ and $|t_{\mathscr{B}}|^2$ of order τ, then we may obtain a well defined limit for small delay τ. In particular we set

$$S_{\mathscr{A}} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{1-2\gamma_{\mathscr{A}}\tau} & -\sqrt{2\gamma_{\mathscr{A}}\tau} \\ \sqrt{2\gamma_{\mathscr{A}}\tau} & \sqrt{1-2\gamma_{\mathscr{A}}\tau} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$S_{\mathscr{B}} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{1-2\gamma_{\mathscr{B}}\tau} & -\sqrt{2\gamma_{\mathscr{B}}\tau} \\ \sqrt{2\gamma_{\mathscr{B}}\tau} & \sqrt{1-2\gamma_{\mathscr{B}}\tau} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\gamma_{\mathscr{A}}$ and $\gamma_{\mathscr{B}}$ are positive constants. The limit $\tau \to 0$ leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\tau\to 0} \Xi(s,\tau) = &\frac{1}{s+\frac{1}{2}(\gamma_{\mathscr{A}}+\gamma_{\mathscr{B}})}\\
&\times \begin{bmatrix} s-\frac{1}{2}\gamma_{\mathscr{A}}+\frac{1}{2}\gamma_{\mathscr{B}} & \sqrt{\gamma_{\mathscr{A}}\gamma_{\mathscr{B}}} \\ \sqrt{\gamma_{\mathscr{A}}\gamma_{\mathscr{B}}} & s+\frac{1}{2}\gamma_{\mathscr{A}}-\frac{1}{2}\gamma_{\mathscr{B}} \end{bmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

which is the transfer function of a single mode with $\omega_0 = 0$ and two input damping with rates $\gamma_{\mathscr{A}}$ and $\gamma_{\mathscr{B}}$, compare with (11).

The limit corresponds to an effective trapped mode associated with the algebraic loop, see for instance [26] and [23].

V. NONLINEAR ELEMENTS

In our final example, we consider an nonlinear element in a quantum transport network. Our example will consist of a quantum dot, modelled as qubit system, acting as the terminal load of a network as shown in Fig. 16.



FIG. 16. (color online) A cavity QED component is connected to a quantum dot (qubit system) so that the qubit is a nonlinear terminal load element. The chain scattering representation is sketched underneath.

We take the SLH coefficients for the two-lead component device (a cavity QED mode a) and the quantum dor to be respectively

$$G_{\text{QED}} \sim \left(\begin{bmatrix} r & t' \\ t & r' \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\gamma_+}a \\ \sqrt{\gamma_+}a \end{bmatrix}, \omega_0 a \right)$$

and

$$G_{\text{QD}} \sim \left(e^{i\phi}, \sqrt{\kappa}\sigma, \omega'\sigma_z \right)$$

where σ is the lowering operator for the quantum dot qubit.

Following the network rules, we first form the parallel sum $G_{\text{QED}} \boxplus G_{\text{QD}}$ which has the model matrix

$$\mathsf{V} = \begin{bmatrix} K_0 & -\left(\sqrt{\gamma_+}r + \sqrt{\gamma_-}t\right) a^\dagger & -\left(\sqrt{\gamma_+}t' + \sqrt{\gamma_-}r'\right) a^\dagger & -e^{i\phi}\sqrt{\kappa}\sigma^\dagger \\ \sqrt{\gamma_+}a & r & t' & 0 \\ \sqrt{\gamma_-}a & t & r' & 0 \\ \sqrt{\kappa}\sigma & 0 & 0 & e^{i\phi} \end{bmatrix}$$

with $K_0 = -\frac{1}{2}\left(\gamma_+ + \gamma_-\right) a^\dagger a - \frac{1}{2}\kappa\sigma^\dagger\sigma - i\omega_0 a^\dagger a - i\omega'\sigma^\dagger\sigma$.



FIG. 17. (color online) The equivalent quantum feedback network for the cavity-qubit system. Below it is the open loop set-up before the feedback connections are made - note that the outputs and input are labelled so that output 1 goes to input 3, output 3 goes to input 2, while output 2 and input 1 are the external fields that remain after the feedback reduction.

We now need to specify the connections we need to make: these are the pairs (s, r) consiting of an output source s and an input range r label, and to wire up the open loop system Fig. 17 these are $(1, 3)$ and $(3, 2)$. the corresponding adjacency matrix is

$$\eta = \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{12} & \eta_{13} \\ \eta_{32} & \eta_{33} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\eta_{sr} = 1$ if (s, r) is a connection, and $= 0$ otherwise. (The adjacency matrix ranges over the indices s, r labelling the outputs and inputs respectively that are to be connected to form the feednback network.)

The feedback reduction formula (3) now gives the closed loop network as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{F}\left(\mathsf{V}, \eta^{-1}\right) &= \begin{bmatrix} K_0 & -\left(\sqrt{\gamma_+}r + \sqrt{\gamma_-}t\right) a^\dagger \\ \sqrt{\kappa}\sigma & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ &+ \begin{bmatrix} -\left(\sqrt{\gamma_+}t' + \sqrt{\gamma_-}r'\right) a^\dagger & -e^{i\phi}\sqrt{\kappa}\sigma^\dagger \\ 0 & e^{i\phi} \end{bmatrix} \\ &\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} t' & 0 \\ r' & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\gamma_+}a & r \\ \sqrt{\gamma_-}a & t \end{bmatrix} \\ &\equiv \begin{bmatrix} K & -L^\dagger S \\ L & S \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

with $K = -\frac{1}{2}L^\dagger L - iH$. After a little algebra we find the equivalent SLH model to be

$$S = e^{i\phi}\left(r + \frac{tt'}{1-r'}\right),$$

$$L = e^{i\phi}\left(\sqrt{\gamma_+} + \frac{t'}{1-r'}\sqrt{\gamma_-}\right) a + \sqrt{\kappa}\sigma, \tag{27}$$

$$\begin{aligned} K = &-\left(\frac{\gamma_+ + \gamma_-}{2} + \sqrt{\gamma_-}\frac{\left(\sqrt{\gamma_+}t' + \sqrt{\gamma_-}r'\right)}{1-r'} + i\omega_0\right) a^\dagger a \\ &-(\frac{1}{2}\kappa + i\omega')\sigma^\dagger\sigma - e^{i\phi}\sqrt{\kappa}\left(\sqrt{\gamma_+} + \frac{t'}{1-r'}\sqrt{\gamma_-}\right)\sigma^\dagger a \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

with the Hamiltonian H determined as the solution to

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{2}L^\dagger L - iH = K_0 &- \sqrt{\gamma_-}\left(\sqrt{\gamma_+}t' + \sqrt{\gamma_-}r'\right)\frac{1}{1-r'}a^\dagger a \\ &-e^{i\phi}\sqrt{\kappa}\left(\sqrt{\gamma_+} + \frac{t'}{1-r'}\sqrt{\gamma_-}\right)\sigma^\dagger a. \end{aligned}$$

The input-output relation is then (with $b_Y^{\rm in} = b_{Y+}$ and $b_Y^{\rm out} = b_{Y-}$)

$$\begin{aligned} b_Y^{\rm out}(t) = &e^{i\phi}\left(r + \frac{tt'}{1-r'}\right) b_Y^{\rm in}(t) \\ &+e^{i\phi}\left(\sqrt{\gamma_+} + \frac{t'}{1-r'}\sqrt{\gamma_-}\right) j_t(a) + \sqrt{\kappa} j_t(\sigma) \end{aligned}$$

where $j_t(a)$ and $j_t(\sigma)$ are the Heisenberg picture values of the operators a and σ. the master equation for joint density states ϱ of the QED cavity and qubit quantum dot are therefore

$$\frac{d}{dt}\varrho = \frac{1}{2}L\varrho L^\dagger - \varrho K^\dagger - K\varrho$$

with L and K given by (27) and (28), respectively.

VI. CONCLUSION

We have started the programme of developing a systematic network theory underlying interconnections of quantum transport components in the direction that has proved successful so far for quantum photonic networks. The existing quantum feedback network is shown to be capable of describing a large class of nonlinear quantum transport components assembled into a network and is applicable to modelling control design, especially as there is a growing interest in on-chip networks for solid state quantum networks, and hybrid quantum transport-photonic circuits. We did not consider applications to control in this paper *per se* but it is clear that many of the techniques currently used in quantum feedback control for photinic networks are immediately applicable to this new domain.

Acknowledgement The author has the pleasant duty to thank the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Cambridge, for support and hospitality during the programme *Quantum Control Engineering* where work on this paper was completed. He is also acknowledges fruitful discussion with Clive Emary on feedback control of quantum transport systems.

Appendix A: proof of Theorem 2

The isometry condition $K^\dagger K = I_{2n}$ implies the identities

$$K_{1i}^\dagger K_{1j} + K_{2i}^\dagger K_{2j} = \delta_{ij} I_n.$$

Now

$$M^\flat = \begin{bmatrix} M_{12}^\dagger & -M_{22}^\dagger \\ -M_{11}^\dagger & M_{21}^\dagger \end{bmatrix}.$$

We establish the $\flat$-isometry property of M: (we collect together in square brackets the various terms where we use the isometric property of K)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left[M^\flat M\right]_{12} \\
&= M_{12}^\dagger M_{12} - M_{22}^\dagger M_{22} \\
&= \left(K_{12}^\dagger - K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger -1} K_{11}^\dagger\right)\left(K_{12} - K_{11}K_{21}^{-1}K_{22}\right) \\
&\quad - \left(K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger -1}\right) K_{21}^{-1} K_{22} \\
&= K_{12}^\dagger K_{12} - \left[K_{12}^\dagger K_{11}\right] K_{21}^{-1} K_{22} - K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger -1}\left[K_{11}^\dagger K_{12}\right] \\
&\quad + K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger -1}\left[K_{11}^\dagger K_{11}\right] K_{21}^{-1} K_{22} \\
&\quad - K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger -1} K_{21}^{-1} K_{22} \\
&= K_{12}^\dagger K_{12} + \left(K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}\right) K_{21}^{-1} K_{22} + K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger -1}\left(K_{21}^\dagger K_{22}\right) \\
&\quad + K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger -1}\left(I_{n_2} - K_{21}^\dagger K_{21}\right) K_{21}^{-1} K_{22} \\
&\quad - K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger -1} K_{21}^{-1} K_{22} \\
&= K_{12}^\dagger K_{12} + K_{22}^\dagger K_{22} = I_{n_1};
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left[M^\flat M\right]_{11} \\
&= M_{12}^\dagger M_{11} - M_{22}^\dagger M_{21} \\
&= \left(K_{12}^\dagger - K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger -1} K_{11}^\dagger\right)\left(K_{11}K_{21}^{-1}\right) \\
&\quad - \left(-K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger -1}\right)\left(K_{21}^{-1}\right) \\
&= \left[K_{12}^\dagger K_{11}\right] K_{21}^{-1} - K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger -1}\left[K_{11}^\dagger K_{11}\right] K_{21}^{-1} \\
&\quad + K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger -1} K_{21}^{-1} \\
&= \left(-K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}\right) K_{21}^{-1} - K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger -1}\left(I_{n_2} - K_{21}^\dagger K_{21}\right) K_{21}^{-1} \\
&\quad + K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger -1} K_{21}^{-1} = 0;
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left[M^\flat M\right]_{22} \\
&= -M_{11}^\dagger M_{12} + M_{21}^\dagger M_{22} \\
&= -\left(K_{21}^{\dagger -1} K_{11}^\dagger\right)\left(K_{12} - K_{11}K_{21}^{-1}K_{22}\right) \\
&\quad + K_{21}^{\dagger -1}\left(-K_{21}^{-1}K_{22}\right) \\
&= -K_{21}^{\dagger -1}\left[K_{11}^\dagger K_{12}\right] + K_{21}^{\dagger -1}\left[K_{11}^\dagger K_{11}\right] K_{21}^{-1} K_{22} \\
&\quad - K_{21}^{\dagger -1} K_{21}^{-1} K_{22} \\
&= K_{21}^{\dagger -1} K_{21}^\dagger K_{22} + K_{21}^{\dagger -1}\left[I_{n_2} - K_{21}^\dagger K_{21}\right] K_{21}^{-1} K_{22} \\
&\quad - K_{21}^{\dagger -1} K_{21}^{-1} K_{22} = 0;
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\left[M^\flat M\right]_{21} &= -M_{11}^\dagger M_{11} + M_{21}^\dagger M_{21}\\ &= -\left(K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{11}^\dagger\right)\left(K_{11}K_{21}^{-1}\right) + K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{21}^{-1}\\ &= -K_{21}^{\dagger-1}\left[K_{11}^\dagger K_{11}\right]K_{21}^{-1} + K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{21}^{-1}\\ &= -K_{21}^{\dagger-1}\left(I_{n_2} - K_{21}^\dagger K_{21}\right)K_{21}^{-1} + K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{21}^{-1}\\ &= I_{n_2}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $M^\flat M = I_n$ as required. The demonstration that the coisometry of K implies the $\flat$-coisometry of M is similar.

We now establish the "only if" part of the theorem. We note that the $\flat$-isometry implies that

$$\begin{aligned}M_{12}^\dagger M_{12} - M_{22}^\dagger M_{22} &= I_{n_1},\\ M_{21}^\dagger M_{21} - M_{11}^\dagger M_{11} &= I_{n_2},\\ M_{12}^\dagger M_{11} - M_{22}^\dagger M_{21} &= 0,\\ M_{21}^\dagger M_{22} - M_{11}^\dagger M_{12} &= 0\end{aligned}$$

and these imply respectively the following identities

$$\begin{aligned}I_{n_1} &= K_{12}^\dagger K_{12} - K_{12}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1}K_{22} - K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{11}^\dagger K_{12}\\ &\quad + K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{11}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1}K_{22} - K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{21}^{-1}K_{22},\end{aligned} \tag{A1}$$

$$I_{n_2} = K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{21}^{-1} - K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{11}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1}, \tag{A2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= K_{12}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1} - K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{11}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1}\\ &\quad + K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{21}^{-1}\end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= -K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{21}^{-1}K_{22} - K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{11}K_{12}\\ &\quad + K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{11}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1}K_{22}\end{aligned} \tag{A4}$$

To show the isometry property of K we note that

$$\begin{aligned}&K_{12}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1}K_{22}\\ &\overset{A3}{=} \left[K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{11}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1} - K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{21}^{-1}\right]K_{22}\\ &= K_{22}^\dagger\left[K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{11}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1} - K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{21}^{-1}\right]K_{22}\\ &\overset{A2}{=} -K_{22}^\dagger K_{22}.\end{aligned} \tag{A5}$$

Now we can compute the matrix elements:

$$\begin{aligned}&K_{12}^\dagger K_{12} + K_{22}^\dagger K_{22}\\ &\overset{A1}{=} I_{n_1} + K_{12}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1}K_{22}\\ &\quad + K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{11}^\dagger K_{12} + K_{22}^\dagger K_{22}\\ &\quad - K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{11}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1}M_{22} + K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{21}^{-1}K_{22}\\ &= I_{n_1} + K_{22}^\dagger\left[-K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{11}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1} + K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{21}^{-1}\right]K_{22}\\ &\quad + K_{12}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1}K_{22} + \left(K_{12}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{22}\right)^\dagger + K_{22}^\dagger K_{22}\\ &\overset{A2}{=} I_{n_1} + 2K_{22}^\dagger K_{22} + K_{12}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1}K_{22}\\ &\quad + \left(K_{12}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1}K_{22}\right)^\dagger\\ &\overset{A5}{=} I_{n_1};\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&K_{12}^\dagger K_{11} + K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}\\ &= \left(K_{12}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1} + K_{22}^\dagger\right)K_{21}\\ &\overset{A3}{=} \left(K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{11}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1} - K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{21}^{-1} + K_{22}^\dagger\right)K_{21}\\ &= K_{22}^\dagger\left(K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{11}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1} - K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{21}^{-1} + I_{n_2}\right)K_{21}\\ &\overset{A2}{=} 0;\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&K_{11}^\dagger K_{12} + K_{21}^\dagger K_{22}\\ &= K_{21}^\dagger\left(\left(K_{12}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1}\right)^\dagger + K_{22}\right)\\ &\overset{A5}{=} K_{21}^\dagger\left(K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{11}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1} - K_{22}^\dagger K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{21}^{-1}\right)^\dagger\\ &\quad + K_{21}^\dagger K_{22}\\ &= K_{21}^\dagger\left(K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{11}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1} - K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{21}^{-1} + I_{n_2}\right)K_{22}\\ &\overset{A2}{=} 0;\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&K_{11}^\dagger K_{11} + K_{21}^\dagger K_{21}\\ &\overset{A2}{=} K_{11}^\dagger K_{11} + K_{21}^\dagger\left(K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{21}^{-1} - K_{21}^{\dagger-1}K_{11}^\dagger K_{11}K_{21}^{-1}\right)K_{21}\\ &= I_{n_2},\end{aligned}$$

whence $K^\dagger K = I_n$ as required.

[1] J. Gough, M.R. James, Commun. Math. Phys. **287**, 1109 (2009)

[2] J. Gough, M.R. James, IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control **54**, 2530 (2009)

[3] C.W. Gardiner and P. Zoller, Quantum Noise (Springer Berlin, 2000)

[4] R.L. Hudson and K.R. Parthasarathy, Commun. Math. Phys. **93**, 301-323 (1984)

[5] S. Datta, Electronic Transport in Mesoscopic Systems, Cambridge Studies in Semiconductor Physics and Microelectronic Engineering, No. 3, Cambridge University Press, (1997)

[6] A. Wallraff, D. I. Schuster, A. Blais, L. Frunzio, R.-S. Huang, J. Majer, S. Kumar, S. M. Girvin and R. J. Schoelkopf, Nature, 162-165 (2004)

[7] D. Englund, A.Faraon, I.Fushman, N. Stoltz, P. Petroff, and J. Vučković, Nature, 857-861 (2007)

[8] A. Faraon, I. Fushman, D. Englund, N. Stoltz, P. Petroff, and J. Vučković, Nature Physics, 859-863 (2008)

[9] J.L. O'Brien, A. Furusawa, J. Vučković, Nature Photonics 3, 687 (2009)

[10] J. Vučković, Quantum optics and cavity QED with quantum dots in photonic crystals, Lectures given at Les Houches 101th summer school on "Quantum Optics and Nanophotonics," August 2013. arXiv:1402.2541

[11] T. Brandes, Phys. Rev. Lett. 105, 060602 (2010)

[12] C. Emary, Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A **371** 1999 (2013)

[13] C. Pöltl, C. Emary, & T. Brandes, Phys. Rev. B, 84, 085302 (2011)

[14] A. Reinhard, T. Volz, M. Winger, A. Badolato, K.J. Hennessy, E.L. Hu and A. Imamoğu, Nature Photonics, 93-96 (2012)

[15] C. Emary, J.E. Gough, arXiv:1407.1306

[16] N. Tezak, A. Niederberger, D.S. Pavlichin, G. Sarma, and H. Mabuchi, Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A, 370, (2012)

[17] G. Sarma, R. Hamerly, N. Tezak, D.S. Pavlichin, H. Mabuchi, IEEE Photonics 5, 1 (2013)

[18] H. Kimura, *Chain-Scattering Approach to H^∞-Control*, System & Control: Foundations & Applications Series Birkhäuser, Boston (1997)

[19] M. Yanagisawa, H. Kimura, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, **48**, No. 12, 2107+2120, December (2003)

[20] M. Yanagisawa, H. Kimura, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, **48**, No. 12, 2121+2132, December (2003)

[21] J.E. Gough, R. Gohm, M. Yanagisawa, Physical Review A 78 (6), 062104 (2008)

[22] G.E. Dullerud, F. Paganini, *A Course in Robust Control theory: A Convex approach*, Texts in Applied Mathematics 36, Springer (1999)

[23] J. Gough, M.R. James, H.I. Nurdin, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 023804 (2010)

[24] R.L. Hudson and K.R. Parthasarathy, Commun. Math. Phys., **104** , no. 3, 457–470 (1986).

[25] The requirement of minimality means that there are no uncontrollable or unobservable modes of the system: this is a standard concept in linear control theory which may be established in the Kalman state-based theory, see [18], [22].

[26] H.A. Bachor and T.C. Ralph. A Guide to Experiments in Quantum Optics. Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, Germany, second edition, (2004)